## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## **CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No. SACV 08-123	2 DOC(RNBx)		Date: December 5, 2008
Title: Jorge Ramirez v. 1	NDEX West, LLC, Americ	cas Servicing Company	
DOCKET ENTRY [I hereby certify that this do respective most recent address of record	d in this action on this date.]	overnment messenger service, postage prepaid	
DDEGENT			
PRESENT:	THE HONORABLE DA	AVID O. CARTER, JUDGE	
	tee Hopkins troom Clerk	Not Pres Court Rep	<u></u>
ATTORNEYS PRE	SENT FOR PLAINTIFFS	: ATTORNEYS PRESENT	FOR DEFENDANTS:
NON	E PRESENT	NONE PRE	ESENT
PROCEEDING (IN CH	AMBERS): ORDER TO S	SHOW CAUSE RE REMAN	D TO STATE COURT
		as removed to this Court purs s to be improper for the reason	
ser reli 526	ved was served with "a coper." 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b); 5 U.S. 344, 347-48, 119 S.	within thirty days of the date py of the initial pleading setti Murphy Bros., Inc. v. Miche Ct. 1322, 1325-26, 143 L. Ed., 857 F. Supp. 707, 709 (N.I.	ing forth the claim for tti Pipe Stringing, Inc., d. 2d 448 (1999); Ford v
[ ] Re	moving party has not alleg	ed when the first defendant t	o be served was served.
	moving party has not alleg e not.	ed which defendants have be	en served and which
MINUTES FORM 11 D	OOC	Initial Page 1	s of Deputy Clerk _kh_ 1 of 3

[X]	Removing party has not alleged when each served defendant was served.
[ ]	Although the case may not have been initially removable, the action was not removed "within thirty days after receipt by the defendant, through service or otherwise, of a copy of an amended pleading, motion, order or other paper from which it may first be ascertained that the case is one which is or has become removable." 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).
[ ]	All defendants have not joined in the notice of removal. Generally, all served defendants must join in removal. <i>Chicago, Rock Island, &amp; Pac. Ry. Co. v. Martin,</i> 178 U.S. 245, 248, 20 S. Ct. 854, 855, 44 L. Ed. 1055 (1900); <i>Parrino v. FHP, Inc.</i> , 146 F.3d 669, 703 (9th Cir. 1998); <i>Hewitt v. City of Stanton</i> , 798 F.2d 1230, 1232 (9th Cir. 1986); <i>Ely Valley Mines, Inc. v. Hartford Accident &amp; Indem. Co.</i> , 644 F.2d 1310, 1314 (9th Cir. 1981).
[ ]	Removal is on the basis of diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 but all plaintiffs are not diverse from all defendants. <i>See</i> 28 U.S.C. § 1332; <i>see also Strawbridge v. Curtiss</i> , 7 U.S. (3 Cranch) 267 (1806).
[ ]	Removal is on the basis of diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 but some of the defendants are California citizens. <i>See</i> 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b).
[ ]	Removal is on the basis of diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332, some of the parties are corporations, and the Notice of Removal does not state both their state of incorporation and principal place of business. 28 U.S.C. § 1332.
[ ]	Removal is on the basis of diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332, the case was <i>not</i> initially removable, and the notice of removal was filed more than one year after commencement of the action. 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b); <i>Ritchey v. Upjohn Drug Co.</i> , 139 F.3d 1313, 1316 (9th Cir. 1998).
[ ]	Removal is on the basis of diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 but the matter in controversy does not appear to exceed \$75,000.
[ ]	Removal is on the basis of federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 on grounds of preemption but it does not appear that any of the claims are subject to complete preemption.

## 

[ ]	Removal is on the basis of federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
	§ 1331 on grounds of the artful pleading doctrine but the claims appear to be
	properly pled.

Accordingly, the Court orders Defendant(s) to show cause in writing by **December 22**, **2008**, why this action should not be remanded. Plaintiff(s) may submit a response in the same time period. The Clerk shall serve this minute order on all parties to the action.